

KABG010025822019



Presented on : 25.02.2019

Registered on : 27.02.2019

Decided on : 25.07.2026

Duration : 7 years 4 months 28 days

**IN THE COURT OF I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE AND
LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND
RESETTLEMENT AUTHORITY, BELAGAVI**

Present :

Sri SUBHASH SANKAD,

B.A., LL.M

I Additional District Judge, Belagavi.

Dated: This the 25th day of July, 2026

L.A.C. No.142/2019

PETITIONER:-

1. Sri Mahadev Channabasappa Kaveri
Age:69 Years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o.Kokatnur, Tal. Athani, Dist. Belagavi

(Sri B.B.H. Advocate)

//Vs//

RESPONDENTS:

1. The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
Hipparagi Barrage Project,
Athani, Dist Belagavi
2. Karnataka Neeravari Nigam Ltd.,
Athani

[R-1 :- R/by DGP] [R-2 :- R/by Sri S.N.G., Adv.]

Meta Data

(The following Meta Data is entered as per the order passed by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, Kalaburagi Bench in MFA No.202752/2023 dated 12.03.2026)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Details
1	Act under which the acquisition is made	The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013
2	Nature of project	Hipparagi Barrage Project
3	Purpose of acquisition	Formation of canal under Karimasuti Lift Irrigation Project
4	Beneficiary of acquisition	Karnataka Niravari Nigam Limited., Hipparagi Barrage Project, Athani
5	Acquisition file No.	LAQ.SR. No.566/2011-2012
6	Date of social impact report	Not applicable
7	Date of preliminary notification (Gazette Publication)	12.04.2012
	Date of final notification (Gazette Publication)	19.12.2013
9	Date of possession/Date of award	01.12.2015
10	Location of property (District/Taluk/Village)	Kokatnur Village, Tal. Athani, Dist. Belagavi
11	Survey number	Sy.No.900/A/A2
12	Extent of land acres/ guntas/ sq.meters / sq.feet	8 Guntas of dry land
13	Market value awarded by acquiring authority (per	Rs.71,017/- per acre Factor-2

	acre/Gunta/Sq.Mtr/ Sq. Ft) with factor	
14	Market value awarded by Reference Court/Authority (Per Acre/Gunta/ Sq.mtr./Sq.Ft.) with factor	Rs.5,37,900/- per acre Factor- 2
15	Market value awarded by appellate court (Per Acre/Gunta/Sq.Mtr/ Sq. Ft) with factor, if applicable	-
16	Date of filing reference	10.05.2018
17	Date on which issues were framed	--
18	Date on which evidence commenced and concluded	Commenced on 15.07.2026 Concluded on 15.07.2026
19	Date of disposal	25.07.2026
20	Amount awarded by Reference Court	Rs.5,37,900/- per acre
21	Amount awarded by appellate court (if applicable)	--
22	Compensation amount already paid by the SLAO to the claimant/s	Rs.83,497/-

JUDGMENT

The Special Land Acquisition Officer, Hipparagi Barrage Project, Athani has made this reference under Section 64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation & Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred as 'Act' for short), on the application made by the petitioner for re-determination of compensation in award bearing No.LAQ/JSR-566/2011-12 dated 01.12.2015.

2. The brief facts of the case is as under:

The petitioner is the owner of acquired land bearing Sy.No.900/A/A2 measuring to the extent of 8 Guntas situated at Kokatanur village. The said land has been acquired by the respondents for the purpose of Karimasuti Lift Irrigation Project. The respondent No.1 has passed award. Being dissatisfied with the quantum of compensation awarded by the respondent No.1, the land owner has submitted application before respondent No.1 under section 64 of the Act, seeking reference to this Authority for re-determination of the compensation. Accordingly, the present reference is made by the respondent No.1 for re-determination of the compensation.

3. The notice on the reference was caused on the applicant and the respondent as required under Section 66 of the Act. Upon service of notice, the applicant has appeared through his counsel. The respondent No.1 has appeared through DGP and the respondent No.2 is represented by the panel advocate. The respondent No.1 and 2 have filed separate objections.

4. The petitioner has contended that while determining the compensation, the respondents have not given proper opportunity of hearing. The respondents have awarded meager

compensation to the acquired land without any basis. The petitioner has further contended that he was growing various commercial crops in the acquired land. Due to acquisition of the land by the respondent Authorities, they were suffered huge loss. The acquired land is fertile irrigated land, without considering the fertility and income generated from the said land, the respondents have awarded meager compensation. With these contentions, the petitioner has prayed to enhance the compensation as prayed in the reference petition.

5. The respondent No.1 has stated in the objection that the application for reference filed under section 64 (1) and (2) of the Act is barred by limitation. Hence, the same is not maintainable. It is further contended that while passing the award, the respondent No.1 has followed all the procedures under the Act and conducted the inquiry properly. By considering all the materials arrived at proper conclusion and awarded the compensation as per the provisions of the Act. The respondent No.1 has given notice to the owner before passing the award. Before passing the award, he has not put-forth his claim before the respondent No.1. Therefore, the petitioner has no *locus standi* to file this application for enhancement of the compensation on any grounds. The respondent

No.1 has further contended that while passing the award, the respondent No.1 has considered the sales statistics in the nearby vicinity is for the relevant period. Absolutely, there is no illegality in the amount of compensation fixed by the respondent No.1. With these objections, he has prayed to dismiss the petition.

6. The respondent No.2 has also contended that the application for reference is not filed within prescribed time limit. Hence, the same deserves to be dismissed as time barred. It is further stated that the petitioner has not received compensation amount under protest. The respondent No.2 has further denied the contentions of the petitioner in the reference petition regarding the compensation awarded is on lower side and the respondent No.1 has not given opportunity to the petitioner. The respondent No.2 has further contended that the respondent No.1 after complying all the formalities prescribed under the Act and also considering the soil, fertility and locality, proximity of the village has awarded the compensation. The compensation awarded by the respondent No.1 is just and proper. As such, no interference is required by this authority. With these submissions, the respondent-2 has prayed to dismiss the petition as time barred.

7. To support his claim, the petitioner has examined his GPA Holder as PW-1 and produced documents as per Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.9. The respondents have not adduced oral evidence. However, they have got marked two documents as Ex.R.1 and 2 with consent of petitioner's counsel.

8. Heard both sides.

9. In view of the contentions raised in the reference petition & objections, the following points arise for consideration:-

- Point No.1:- Whether the petitioner has not made the Application seeking reference, before the respondent No.1 within time limit?
- Point No.2:- Whether the reference made by the respondent No.1 the Special Land Acquisition Officer is time barred?
- Point No.3:- Whether the petitioner proves that the respondent while passing the award has not determined the proper market value for the acquired land and not awarded the fair compensation?
- Point No.4:- Whether the petitioner has made out reasonable grounds for enhancement of the compensation and consequently, the reference petition filed by the petitioner deserves to be allowed?
- Point No.5:- What Order?

10. The petitioner has produced the documents as per Ex.P1 to Ex.P.9. Ex.P.1 is the GPA, Ex.P.2 is the Reference

Application, Ex.P.3 is the Certified copy of sale deed dated 08.04.2008 of Kokatnur village, Ex.P.4 is the Certified copy of sale deed dated 13.05.2008 of Kokatnur village, Ex.P.5 is the Certified copy of rectification deed dated 29.7.2009 of Kokatnur village, Ex.P.6 is the Certified copy of agreement to sell dated 21.01.2010, Ex.P.7 is the Certified copy of agreement to sell dated 17.8.2010 of Kokatnur village. Ex.P.8 is the certified copy of judgment in LAC No.145/2019 and Ex.P.9 is the copy of acknowledgment of compensation along with payment register extract.

11. My answer to the above points is as under:

Point No.1:- In the Negative;

Point No.2:- In the Negative;

Point No.3:- In the Affirmative;

Point No.4:- Partly in the Affirmative.

Point No.5:- As per the final order, for the following:

REASONS

12. **Point Nos.1 and 2 :-** Since these points require common discussion, to avoid repetition of discussion, these points is taken for common consideration.

13. Respondent Nos.1 and 2 have stated in their objections that the application seeking reference petition filed by the petitioner

is not within time and the same is time barred. The suggestions in this regard was also put to PW-1 by the counsel for respondents. PW-1 has denied the said suggestions and he has stated that he has filed Reference petition in time.

14. As per section 64(1) of the Act, the aggrieved person must make an application seeking reference within 6 weeks from the date of the award, if the person making the application was present or represented before the Collector at the time when the award is made by him. In other cases within 6 weeks from the date of service of notice under section 21, or within 6 months from the date of the Collector's award which period shall first expire. There is no materials on record to show that the petitioner has participated in the award proceedings. Hence, the 2nd clause ie., within 6 weeks from the date of service of notice has to be taken into account to decide the limitation point. In the present case, as per the schedule prepared under section 64(1) and (2) of the Act, which form the part of the award, the notice which is issued after passing the award was served on the petitioner on 20.12.2017. Thereafter the petitioner has made the application for reference on 10.05.2018.

15. The application for reference made on 10.05.2018 is not within 6 weeks from the date of service of notice i.e. 20.12.2017

neither it is within 6 months from the date of award i.e. from 01.12.2015. Though the application for reference appears to be made beyond 6 months from the date of award or 6 weeks from the date of service of notice, same cannot be considered as beyond limitation. Because, except schedule as per Ex.R.1 no other documents is available to show the service of notice. Further, though the Reference is made beyond 6 months from the date of award, however no materials is available on record to show that the petitioner herein have got knowledge of passing of the award. It is only after service of notice, the petitioner herein has filed application seeking reference. As it is stated herein above notice came to be served on 20.12.2017 as per the schedule which is part of Ex.R.1. When the reference was made on 10.05.2018, for the purpose of computation of limitation, it is the date of service of notice which has to be considered as date of knowledge. Under such circumstances, the petitioner cannot be deprived of his right of making application for reference.

16. Therefore, considering the date of service of notice, i.e. 20.12.2017 as starting point of limitation, application for reference made on 10.05.2018 is within time. Though there is no specific order regarding condonation of delay by the respondent no.1, in

view of provision contained under proviso to section 64(2), the application for reference made needs to be considered as within the limitation. In that view, the reference application made by the petitioner is in time. Hence, it is held that application made by the petitioner for reference is filed within time. Accordingly point no.1 is answered in the Negative.

17. The respondent No.2 has further contended that, the SLAO has to send the reference to the Authority within 30 days from the date of receipt of the application. In the event, if he fails to make reference to this Authority, petitioner shall make an application before this Authority as per 2nd proviso to section 64(1) of the Act seeking direction to respondent No.1 to send the reference to this Authority. In the present case, neither the respondent No.1 has sent the reference to this Authority within 30 days nor the petitioner has filed application before this Authority under section 64(1) of the Act seeking direction to the respondent No.1 to send the reference. Hence, reference petition is beyond limitation.

18. In view of the aforementioned contentions, it is necessary to refer section 64 of the Act. The 1st proviso to section 64(1) of the Act casts duty on the Collector/SLAO to make reference to the Authority within 30 days. Further, 2nd proviso provides that,

if the Collector fails to make such reference within the period so specified, the applicant may apply to the Authority, as the case may be, requesting it to direct the Collector to make the reference to it within a period of thirty days. The 1st and 2nd proviso to section 64(1) corresponds to sub-section (3) clause (a) and (b) to section 18 of the L.A.Act 1894. Section 18(3)(a) casts the same duty on the Deputy Commissioner to make the reference within 90 days. In the event, the Deputy Commissioner fails to make the reference, the applicant may make application to the Court requesting the court to direct the Deputy Commissioner to make the reference. This provision further provides that the court may direct the Deputy Commissioner to make the reference within such time as the court may fix. Though 90 days limitation was fixed for Deputy Commissioner to make the reference to the court under section 18(3)(a) of the old Act, no time limit was fixed under clause (b) to section 18(3). The discretion was left with the court to fix the date for reference to be made by the Deputy Commissioner. However, 2nd proviso to section 64(1) of the Act provides that the petitioner may directly apply to the Authority, as the case may be, requesting it to direct the Collector to make the reference to it within a period of thirty days. In the case on hand, the petitioner has made the

application before the SLAO seeking for reference on 10.05.2018 and SLAO has forwarded the same to this Authority on 07.12.2018.

19. At this juncture, I feel it appropriate to refer the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Karnataka Vs Laxuman** reported in **(2005) 8 Supreme Court Cases 709**. In this case, while considering identical provision under section 18(3) of L.A. Act (as in force in the State of Karnataka) which is in *pari materia* with the 1st and 2nd proviso to section 64 of the act, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that object of providing time of 90 days to Deputy Commissioner to make reference was to prevent undue delay in making highly belated references, sometimes based on applications clandestinely received. It is further held that since no time limit for applying to the court is fixed by the statute since the application is to the court, under a special enactment, Article 142 of the Limitation Act, 1963, which is residuary article would apply. It is therefore held that such application has to be made within three years of the application for making a reference or the expiry of 90 days after such application. The Hon'ble Apex Court has specifically held that, having made an application for reference within time before the Deputy Commissioner, the petitioner may loose his right by not enforcing the right available to him within the

time prescribed by law. In the circumstances of the case, Hon'ble Apex Court has held that right of the Deputy Commissioner to make the reference on the application of the petitioner stands extinguished and right of the petitioner to move the Court for compelling a reference also stands extinguished on the expiry of 3 years and 90 days from the date of application for reference.

20. If the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court is applied to the case on hand, it is clear that SLAO shall make reference to this Authority within a period of 3 years from the date of application or expiry of 30 days thereafter.

21. In the present case, the reference petition was received on 07.12.2018 whereas the application for reference was made before the SLAO on 10.05.2018. The same is within 3 years. Hence, the reference made by the SLAO is not time barred. In the result point No.2 is answered in the Negative.

22. **Point No.3 and 4:-** Since these points require common discussion, to avoid repetition of discussion, these points is taken for common consideration.

23. First contention with regard to enhancement of compensation, raised by the respondent No.1 is that the petitioner has not raised objection before the respondent No.1 by producing

necessary documents showing actual sale price. Hence, he has no *locus standi* to claim enhancement of compensation. Though this specific objection is raised, the respondent No.1 has not specified any provision under which a land loser has to make request for re-consideration of award. Only because soon after passing award or before passing award, the petitioner has not made any request for re-consideration or re-determination of compensation, that itself will not take away right of the petitioner for seeking enhancement of compensation. Further, section 64[1] of the Act confers the right on the land loser to make reference before Collector to refer the reference to the Authority for re-determination of the compensation. This is a statutory right conferred by the Act on the land loser. The same cannot be denied only because the land loser has not made any request before the Collector. Therefore, it is held that there is no force in the contention of the respondents that petitioner has no *locus-standi* for claiming any enhancement of compensation.

24. The respondent No.1 has considered the average sale price of lands of Kokatnur village sold within preceding 3 years from the date of notification. As per the award, it is stated that the respondent No.1 has considered 50% highest sale deeds which is

registered from 11.04.2009 to 12.03.2012 and determined the compensation at Rs.71,017/- per acre.

25. The petitioner has contended that the compensation awarded by the respondent No.1 is very less. The respondent No.1 has not taken into consideration the fact that the value of land keeps increasing every year. By considering the sale deeds only of meager value, the respondent No.1 has determined the market value which is not just compensation. The petitioner has produced judgment dated 05.12.2025 in LAC No.145/2019 as per Ex.P.8, passed by this Authority. In this case, the market value of the land was redetermined at Rs.5,37,900/- per acre. The acquired land in the present case and the land pertaining to Ex.P.8 are situated at the same village and they are acquired for the same purpose. Further the petitioner has produced same documents which were produced in the judgment as per Ex.P.8. Hence, same documents are considered.

26. The petitioner has produced the sale deeds of Kokatnur and agreements to sell of Kokatnur village as per Ex.P.3 to Ex.P.5. Ex.P.3 and Ex.P.4 is the sale deeds and Ex.P.5 is rectification of sale deed dated 5.12.2007. Ex.P.6 and Ex.P.7 is agreements to sell. As regards consideration of agreement to sell as per Ex.P.6 and Ex.P.7,

it is worth to mention here that Ex.P.6 is registered on 21.01.2010 and Ex.P.7 is registered on 17.08.2010. Though they were executed long back, there is no evidence to show that the agreed sale under Ex.P.6 and Ex.P.7 were confirmed by executing registered sale deeds. In that view, in my opinion, it may not be appropriate to consider Ex.P.6 and Ex.P.7 agreements to sell for determination of average sale price. The remaining is the sale deeds as per Ex.P.3 to Ex.P.5. Ex.P.3 is registered on 8.4.2008. Ex.P.4 is registered on 13.5.2008 and Ex.P.5 rectification deed dated 29.07.2009. Among these three sale deeds, only Ex.P.3 and Ex.P.4 appears to be nearer to 3 years from the date of registration. However neither Ex.P.3 nor Ex.P.4 comes within 3 years from the date of notification.

27. The respondent No.1 and 2 have vehemently argued that as per Section 26 of the Act, only sale deeds which is registered within preceding 3 years from the date of notification have to be considered. The sale deeds produced by the petitioner in the present case cannot be considered. They do not fall within the criteria of registered within preceding 3 years. No doubt this submission of respondent No.1 and 2 is worthy of acceptance. However, what needs to be given importance is the object of the Act which is to award fair compensation. While determining the compensation to

the acquired land also this authority has to adopt fairness which means fairness to land loser as well as acquiring Authority. It is appropriate to observe at this juncture that the value of land will not remain static. It keep increasing. To make the compensation fair enough, it is appropriate to adopt method of escalation to some extent within permissible limit. No doubt, the Act does not provide for adopting method of escalation. However, in catena of judgments the Hon'ble Apex Court and the Hon'ble High Courts have laid down the principle of escalation at admissible rate. It is worth to mention the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Ramesh Kumar Vs Bhatinda Integrated Co-operative Cotton Spinning Mill and others** reported in **(2022) 1 SCC 284** wherein, the Hon'ble Apex Court by referring to earlier judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **ONGC Vs Rameshbhai Jeevanbhai Patel [(2008) 14 SCC 745]** has held that 10% of escalation per year would be reasonable.

28. In the present case, as it is stated herein above, only Ex.P.3 and Ex.P.4 nearer to the criteria of registration within 3 years preceding the notification. Only Ex.P.3 appears to be reasonable for determination of average sale price.

29. The extent of land sold under Ex.P.3 is 2 acres 10 guntas i.e. 90 guntas for consideration of Rs.10,00,000/- which is Rs.11,111.11 per gunta. Same will be Rs.4,44,444.40 per acre. For the purpose of convenience same is rounded off to Rs.4,44,500/-. Ex.P.3 is registered on 8.4.2008. The same do not fall within criteria of registration within preceeding 3 years as the notice was issued on 12.4.2012. The acquired land is situated at Kokatnur village. Though the respondent No.1 has considered the sale deeds of Kokatnur village, Ex.P.3 is not taken into account because it is not registered within preceeding 3 years from the date of notice. As observed supra, the value of land will not remain static. It keep increasing. Though Ex.P.3 is not registered within preceeding 3 years. Taking escalation for one year @ 10% of Rs.4,44,500/- to make it fall within the criteria of registration within preceeding 3 years, would make the compensation fair and also reasonable. In view of the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **ONGC Vs Rameshbhai Jeevanbhai Patel** supra, escalation in the market value must be not on flat rate, it must be cumulative. In that view, escalation is calculated as under:-

1.	First year escalation.	Rs.4,44,450 + 10% = Rs.4,88,895 (Rs.4,44,450+Rs.44,445)
----	------------------------	--

2.	Second year escalation	Rs.4,88,895+10% = Rs.537784.50 (Rs.4,88,895+48889.5) rounded off to Rs.5,37,900/-
----	------------------------	---

30. This is the actual sale price of land per acre as per Ex.P.3, as per Section 26 of Act. The same is required to be considered for determination of market value in the present case. Thus the market value of acquired land in the present case is re-determined at Rs.5,37,900/- per acre.

31. The acquired land is situated in rural area. So, the market value has to be multiplied by Factor-2 as per First Schedule of the Act. Further, the petitioner is also entitled for 100% solatium as per Section 30(1) and Schedule-1 of the Act. Further, the petitioner is also entitled for additional market value @ 12% per annum on the market value from the date of publication of the notification of the Social Impact Assessment Study till the date of award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier, under section 30(3) of the Act. In the case on hand, there is no evidence on record to show the specific date of taking possession. Hence, the date of the award is considered to calculate the 12% Additional Market Value. Therefore, the petitioner

is entitled for 12% additional market value on the market value from 12.4.2012 to 01.12.2015 as per section 30(3) of the Act.

32. Further, the petitioner is also entitled for interest @ 9% per annum for a period of one year, on the excess compensation from the date of taking possession. Thereafter, interest @ 15% per annum till deposit of the amount as per Section 72 of the Act.

33. Though, the respondent No.1 has stated in the Award that, he has considered the sale deeds of Kokatanur, registered within preceding 3 years from the date of notification and taken into account 50% of the sale deeds wherein highest sale price is mentioned, he has failed to award fair compensation. By producing the sale deed as per Ex.P.3, there is reasonable grounds for enhancement of the compensation. The petitioner has claimed enhancement of compensation to the extent of Rs.25,00,000/- per acre with statutory benefits. However, by reconsidering the material available on record, the market value of the acquired land is re-determined at Rs.5,37,900/- per acre. In the result, petition deserves to be allowed in part. Accordingly, Point No.3 is answered in the affirmative and Point No.4 is answered partly in the affirmative.

34. **Point No.5:-** In view of reasons on Point Nos.1 to 4, I pass the following:

ORDER

The reference petition filed under Section 64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 by the petitioner is hereby partly allowed with costs.

The market value in respect of the acquired land bearing Sy.No.900/A/A2 measuring to the extent of 8 Guntas situated at Kokatanur village is re-determined at Rs.5,37,900/- per acre.

The acquired land is situated in Rural area, hence, the market value shall be multiplied by Factor-2 as per Schedule-I of the Act. Further, the petitioner is entitled for 100% solatium as per Section 30(1) and Schedule-I of the Act.

The petitioner is entitled for additional market value @ 12% per annum on the market value from the date of publication of the notification of the Social Impact Assessment Studies till the date of the award i.e from 12.4.2012 to 01.12.2015 as per Section 30(3) of the Act.

Further, the petitioner is also entitled for interest @ 9% per annum on excess compensation for a period of one year from the date of dispossession i.e from 01.12.2015 and thereafter, @ 15% per annum for the

subsequent period till the date of deposit of enhanced compensation as per Section 72 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

The petitioner is entitled for enhancement of compensation in the above terms.

The amount, if any, already paid to the petitioner, shall be deducted in the total compensation.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade-III directly on computer, corrected and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this 25th day of July-2026)

(SUBHASH SANKAD)
I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE
& LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION
& RESETTLEMENT AUTHORITY,
BELAGAVI

ANNEXURE

List of Witness examined on behalf of petitioner:

PW-1 :- Smt.Sujata W/o.Mahadev Kaveri,
R/o. Kokatnur, Tal. Athani, Dist. Belagavi.

List of Documents marked on behalf of petitioner:

Ex.P.1 :- General Power of Attorney
Ex.P.2 :- Reference Application
Ex.P.3 :- Certified copy of sale deed dated 08.04.2008 of
Kokatnur village,
Ex.P.4 :- Certified copy of sale deed dated 13.05.2008 of
Kokatnur village,
Ex.P.5 :- Certified copy of rectification deed dated 29.7.2009 of
Kokatnur village,
Ex.P.6 :- Certified copy of agreement to sell dated 21.01.2010 of

- Kokatnur village
- Ex.P.7 :- Certified copy of agreement to sell dated 17.8.2010 of Kokatnur village
- Ex.P.8 :- Certified copy of the judgment in LAC No.145/2019
- Ex.P.9 :- Copy of acknowledgment of compensation along with payment register extract

List of Witnesses examined on behalf of Respondents:-

-Nil-

List of Documents marked on behalf of Respondents:-

- Ex.R.1 Notice
- Ex.R.2 Award

**(SUBHASH SANKAD)
I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE
& LAND ACQUISITION,
REHABILITATION & RESETTLEMENT
AUTHORITY, BELAGAVI**